Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	4

TATYANA	EVGENIEVNA
DREVALE	VA,
	Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Defendants.

TATYANA EVGENIEVNA DREVALEVA,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. <u>19-cv-01454-HSG</u>

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO VACATE JUDGMENT

Re: Dkt. Nos. 91, 92

Case No. 19-cv-2665-HSG

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO VACATE JUDGMENT

Re: Dkt. No. 101

Before the Court are Plaintiff's related motions pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(4) to vacate the judgments long ago entered in favor of Defendants. Each motion is the third motion to vacate that Plaintiff has filed in these cases. Rule 60(b) "provides an 'exception to finality' that 'allows a party to seek relief from a final judgment, and request reopening of [her] case, under a limited set of circumstances." United Student Aid Funds, Inc. v. Espinosa, 559 U.S. 260, 269, 130 S.Ct. 1367, 176 L.Ed.2d 158 (2010). "Rule 60(b)(4) applies only in the rare instance where a judgment is premised either on a certain type of jurisdictional error or on a violation of due process that deprives a party of notice or the opportunity to be heard." *Id.* at 271.

Plaintiff's motions fail to meet this standard, especially given that the Ninth Circuit dismissed her appeal in each case as frivolous several years ago. See Case. No. 19-2665, Dkt. No.

Case 4:19-cv-01454-HSG Document 95 Filed 10/24/23 Page 2 of 2

	2
	3
	4
	5 6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
iia	12
liforr	13
Northern District of Califor	14
trict (15
ı Dis	15 16
rthen	17
$\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{O}}$	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27

28

United States District Court

1

98; Case No. 19-1454, Dkt. No. 88. Accordingly, the court DENIES Plaintiff's motions in Case
No. 19-1454, Dkt. Nos. 91, 92 and Case No. 19-2665, Dkt. No. 101. In addition, given Plaintiff's
long history of repetitive and abusive lawsuits and her refusal to recognize that these cases are
over as confirmed by the Ninth Circuit, her electronic filing privileges are REVOKED , and the
Clerk is again DIRECTED not to accept any further filings in these closed cases or any related
case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 10/24/2023

HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR. United States District Judge